

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the application. Claim 31 is hereby cancelled.

Claims 1-30 and 32-35 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to address the Examiner's concern. More specifically, the mounting assembly is characterized as having a second portion that is at least partially formed on the mounting portion and accessible for use by reconfiguring a part of the mounting assembly.

In light of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-30 and 32-35 under 35 USC §112 is requested.

Claims 32-35 stand objected to as each being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 32 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 33-35 each depend directly or indirectly from rewritten claim 32, so as to be allowable.

Claims 8-12, 23, 24 and 27 are indicated to be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form and the rejection under 35 USC §112 being overcome.

Claims 8, 10 and 23 have been amended in the same manner as claims 1 and 16, as noted above, to address the alleged problem under 35 USC §112. These three claims have also been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable. Claims 9, 11, 12, 24 and 27 each depend from one of these rewritten claims so as to be allowable as well.

Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 13-22, 25, 26 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,598,823 (Swinderman). Reconsideration of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to characterize the second connecting portion as at least partially formed on the mounting portion to be accessible for use by reconfiguring a part of the mounting assembly.

Swinderman does not teach or suggest any reconfiguration of a corresponding mounting assembly. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claims 2-7 and 13-15 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

The mounting assembly in claim 16 has been amended as in claim 1. The arguments advanced relative to the allowability of claim 1 apply equally to claim 16. Claims 17-22 and 25-29 depend cognately from claim 16 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite the step of reconfiguring the mounting assembly. The step of joining the cleaning blade is characterized as occurring after reconfiguring the mounting assembly.

As noted above, Swinderman does not teach or suggest any reconfiguration of a corresponding mounting assembly. Accordingly, claim 30 is believed allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-30 and 32-35 and allowance of the case are requested.

Enclosed is the additional claim fee of \$400.00. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By



John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Feb 7, 2005